

CLUSTER: SECONDARY TRANSITION

OBJECTIVE: All youth with disabilities, beginning at fourteen and younger, when appropriate, receive individualized, coordinated transition services, designed within an outcome-oriented process, which promotes movement from school to post-school activities.

RELATED MISSOURI PERFORMANCE GOAL(s):

The percentage of students with disabilities graduating with a regular diploma will increase.

The percentage of students with disabilities that drop out of school will decrease.

The percentage of students with disabilities participating in vocational preparation programs is consistent with the percentage of participation in the general population of students.

The percentage of students with disabilities employed or enrolled in continuing education six months **post vocational training** will increase or be maintained at a high level.

The percentage of students with disabilities employed or enrolled in continuing education six months **post graduation** will increase or be maintained at a high level.

Notes:

- Components and indicators marked with an “*” are included in Cluster Lite.
- Related professional development is listed under the indicators. For descriptions of the professional development, please refer to the Comprehensive System of Professional Development section.
- General notes about the data analyzed in this report can be found in the Data Explanations section.

COMPONENT BT.1*: After exiting school, are youth with disabilities prepared for employment, post-secondary education and/or independent living?

Overview Answer: In general, the statewide graduation rate has been increasing, the dropout rate has been decreasing and just under 90 percent of the students with disabilities who graduated are employed or in post-secondary education. There has been an increase in the number of students with disabilities being served by the Centers for Independent Living. All this suggests that, in general, youth with disabilities are prepared for life after high school, however, a significant amount of work remains to be done in this area.

Strengths: Five of eight of Missouri's performance goals for children with disabilities deal with secondary transition. Goals address increasing the graduation rate and decreasing the dropout rate as well as making vocational programs available to students with disabilities in order to better prepare them for life after high school. Secondary transition is an important focus and there have been advances in transition services in Missouri. Among the efforts which led to these advances are a Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) developed individualized education program (IEP) model, the A+ program, the Vocational Rehabilitation Cooperative (VR COOP) program, Missouri Transition Alliance Partnership (MOTAP) project, Vocational Rehabilitation/Special Education joint professional development training, improved monitoring processes, establishment of standards and increased awareness of the transition process. Related Comprehensive System of Personnel Development (CSPD) activities are listed for each indicator. From these lists, it is evident that professional development is readily available for educators in Missouri.

The junior and senior high school students with disabilities who participated in the eight focus groups reported that they felt they had been very well prepared for life beyond school. Those who wanted to go on to post-secondary education had support in determining the two-year or four-year colleges that would meet their needs and they said they felt prepared to move on. Those who wanted to work had a variety of support within their schools: hands-on opportunities to experience the type of work they thought they were interested in were available, contacts with potential employers were available, and in some cases, students were able to have mentors as they began to work a limited number of hours with potential employers. The students were enthusiastic about the high school teachers and counselors who had provided encouragement and support for them. They considered the teachers and counselors friends and planned to report back to them on their progress. In one case, a boy was just eager to graduate so he could work full time and earn more money. He just wanted to get his classes out of the way but he realized a diploma was important so he was staying in school to graduate. The students were very enthusiastic and were quite willing to share their challenges and their successes as well as their plans for the future.

Areas of Concern: While statewide data shows improvement in graduation and dropout rates, many individual districts are not showing improvement. There is concern about the lack of data on Independent Living services available and how students are accessing those services. There is limited data available on referrals to Vocational Rehabilitation, and the number of VR COOP participants that graduated and are employed. The Division of Special Education and Vocational Rehabilitation are in the process of coordinating databases so that this data can be collected.

Other Comments: In the future, professional development related to secondary transition will be available on-line to provide greater access to the information. Decisions regarding the need for various types of professional development will be data driven. The Division needs to determine the impact of professional development at the local level.

Improvement strategies recommended by the committee include:

- Secondary and post-secondary institutions should work together to determine the best transition services for students with disabilities who enter two and/or four-year colleges and universities
- Strategies should be employed to educate students with disabilities to advocate for transition services in the post-school setting (e.g., work, post-secondary education, etc.)
- Increased cross-training between outside agencies and school district staff in the area of transition
- Districts should investigate ways to involve more businesses in the transition process by building better business partnerships to assure that schools, parents, students and employers are aware of employment opportunities and the potential of students with disabilities.

Note: Data for the indicators compares students with disabilities to all students rather than to non-disabled students. Data is collected in such a way that calculating rates for non-disabled students would be prone to error.

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION																								
<p>BT.1.1*: Is the rate of youth with disabilities graduating with a regular diploma comparable to that of youth without disabilities?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Dropout and graduation data <p>Related CSPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Access to the General Education CurriculumAccommodation and Modification for Classroom Instruction and Assessment (Manual)EduequityIssues in Education Technical Assistance BulletinMissouri Math InitiativeMissouri Transition Alliance Project (MOTAP)Network for High Schools with ResultsPositive Behavioral SupportsPriority SchoolsSecondary Transition	<p>Data Summary:</p> <table><tr><th colspan="4">Graduation Rate Summary</th></tr><tr><th></th><th colspan="2">Students with Disabilities*</th><th>All Students</th></tr><tr><th>Year</th><th>Number of Graduates</th><th>Graduation Rate</th><th>Graduation Rate</th></tr><tr><td>2000-2001</td><td>4,605</td><td>59.5%</td><td>81.4%</td></tr><tr><td>1999-2000</td><td>4,451</td><td>53.4%</td><td>80.3%</td></tr><tr><td>1998-1999</td><td>3,966</td><td>53.1%</td><td>78.5%</td></tr></table> <p>*Excludes Department of Corrections (DOC), Division of Youth Services (DYS), Missouri School for the Blind (MSB), Missouri School for the Deaf (MSD) and State Schools for the Severely Handicapped (SSSH)</p> <p>Notes: “All Student” data from the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) web site. Graduation rate formula: Graduates / (9-12 Cohort Dropouts + Graduates). “Students with Disabilities” data from Screen 12 of Core Data as of June 5, 2002. Graduation rate formula: Graduates with a diploma / (Graduates with a diploma + Dropouts).</p> <p>Committee Conclusions:</p> <p>The graduation rates of students with disabilities are significantly lower than that of all students for each of the reported years, however the gap decreased for the 2000-2001 school year. The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education’s (DESE’s) current system of collecting data makes it difficult to compare children with disabilities with non-disabled children. Data for all students includes students with disabilities in the totals.</p>	Graduation Rate Summary					Students with Disabilities*		All Students	Year	Number of Graduates	Graduation Rate	Graduation Rate	2000-2001	4,605	59.5%	81.4%	1999-2000	4,451	53.4%	80.3%	1998-1999	3,966	53.1%	78.5%
Graduation Rate Summary																									
	Students with Disabilities*		All Students																						
Year	Number of Graduates	Graduation Rate	Graduation Rate																						
2000-2001	4,605	59.5%	81.4%																						
1999-2000	4,451	53.4%	80.3%																						
1998-1999	3,966	53.1%	78.5%																						

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION
<p>BT.1.2: Is the rate of youth with disabilities graduating with a regular diploma increasing annually?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dropout and graduation data • Monitoring data <p>Related CSPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to the General Education Curriculum • Accommodation and Modification for Classroom Instruction and Assessment (Manual) • Eduequity • Issues in Education Technical Assistance Bulletin • Missouri Math Initiative • Missouri Transition Alliance Project (MOTAP) • Network for High Schools with Results • Positive Behavioral Supports • Priority Schools • Secondary Transition 	<p>Data Summary: Graduation Data – See BT.1.1</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Monitoring Data</p> <p>FY2002 Monitoring Standard Secondary Transition-3 – The percentage of students with disabilities graduating with a regular diploma will increase: 19 of 87, 21.84 percent of agencies noncompliant</p> <p>Committee Conclusions: The statewide graduation rate of students with disabilities has increased annually for the last three years, however over 20 percent of districts monitored for this standard in FY2002 were found to have not met the standard.</p>

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION																								
<p>BT.1.3*: Is the dropout rate for youth with disabilities comparable to that for youth without disabilities?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Dropout and graduation dataMonitoring data <p>Related CSPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Access to the General Education CurriculumAccommodation and Modification for Classroom Instruction and Assessment (Manual)Issues in Education Technical Assistance BulletinMissouri Math InitiativeMissouri Transition Alliance Project (MOTAP)Network for High Schools with ResultsPositive Behavioral SupportsPriority SchoolsSecondary Transition	<p>Data Summary:</p> <table><tr><th colspan="4">Dropout Rate Summary</th></tr><tr><th></th><th colspan="2">Students with Disabilities*</th><th>All Students</th></tr><tr><th>Year</th><th>Number of Dropouts</th><th>Dropout Rate</th><th>Dropout Rate</th></tr><tr><td>2000-2001</td><td>3,138</td><td>7.6%</td><td>4.5%</td></tr><tr><td>1999-2000</td><td>3,880</td><td>9.6%</td><td>4.3%</td></tr><tr><td>1998-1999</td><td>3,504</td><td>9.1%</td><td>4.7%</td></tr></table> <p>* Excludes Department of Corrections (DOC), Division of Youth Services (DYS), Missouri School for the Blind (MSB), Missouri School for the Deaf (MSD) and State Schools for the Severely Handicapped (SSSH)</p> <p>Notes: “All Student” data from Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) web site. Dropout Rate formula: 9-12 Dropouts / 9-12 Average Enrollment. “Students with Disabilities” data from Screen 12 of Core Data as of 6/5/02. Dropout Rate formula: Dropouts / Child Count (14-22 years). “Dropouts” for students with disabilities include students who received a certificate; reached maximum age; moved, and are not known to be continuing; and dropped out.</p> <p>Monitoring Data</p> <p>FY2002 Monitoring Standard Dropouts-1 – Dropout rates for children with disabilities decrease and are no higher than those of children without disabilities: 35 of 89, 39.33 percent of agencies noncompliant</p> <p>Committee Conclusions:</p> <p>The dropout rate of youth with disabilities is significantly higher that of all students for each of the last three years, however the gap decreased significantly in the 2000-2001 school year. DESE's current system of collecting data makes it difficult to compare children with disabilities with non-disabled children. Data for all students includes students with disabilities.</p>	Dropout Rate Summary					Students with Disabilities*		All Students	Year	Number of Dropouts	Dropout Rate	Dropout Rate	2000-2001	3,138	7.6%	4.5%	1999-2000	3,880	9.6%	4.3%	1998-1999	3,504	9.1%	4.7%
Dropout Rate Summary																									
	Students with Disabilities*		All Students																						
Year	Number of Dropouts	Dropout Rate	Dropout Rate																						
2000-2001	3,138	7.6%	4.5%																						
1999-2000	3,880	9.6%	4.3%																						
1998-1999	3,504	9.1%	4.7%																						

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION
<p>BT.1.4: Is the dropout rate of youth with disabilities decreasing annually?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Dropout and graduation data• Monitoring data <p>Related CSPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Access to the General Education Curriculum• Accommodation and Modification for Classroom Instruction and Assessment (Manual)• Issues in Education Technical Assistance Bulletin• Missouri Math Initiative• Missouri Transition Alliance Project (MOTAP)• Network for High Schools with Results• Positive Behavioral Supports• Priority Schools• Secondary Transition	<p>Data Summary: See BT.1.3</p> <p>Committee Conclusions: The dropout rate of students with disabilities decreased from 9.1 percent in the 1998-1999 school year to 7.6 percent in the 2000-2001 school year. While there was an increase in the middle year, the data shows an overall decrease in the dropout rates for students with disabilities. While statewide rates are decreasing, monitoring data indicates that nearly forty percent of districts have dropout rates that are not decreasing.</p>

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION																																																															
<p>BT.1.5*: Is the percentage of youth with disabilities participating in post-school activities (e.g., employment, education, etc.) comparable to that of non-disabled students?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Graduate follow-up data <p>Related CSPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Access to the General Education CurriculumMissouri Transition Alliance Project (MOTAP)Network for High Schools with ResultsPositive Behavioral SupportsSecondary Transition	<p>Data Summary:</p> <p>Follow-up on Previous Years' Graduates (Six-month Follow-up)</p> <table><tr><th></th><th colspan="2">1999 Graduates</th><th colspan="2">2000 Graduates</th><th colspan="2">2001 Graduates</th></tr><tr><th></th><th>All</th><th>Disabled</th><th>All</th><th>Disabled</th><th>All</th><th>Disabled</th></tr><tr><td>2-Year College</td><td>22.7%</td><td>18.2%</td><td>23.1%</td><td>20.6%</td><td>24.7%</td><td>23.6%</td></tr><tr><td>4-Year College</td><td>39.6%</td><td>8.5%</td><td>40.0%</td><td>12.0%</td><td>40.0%</td><td>12.6%</td></tr><tr><td>Employed *</td><td>24.4%</td><td>51.7%</td><td>22.7%</td><td>46.2%</td><td>21.5%</td><td>41.7%</td></tr><tr><td>Military</td><td>3.3%</td><td>3.7%</td><td>3.7%</td><td>3.2%</td><td>3.7%</td><td>2.9%</td></tr><tr><td>Non-college</td><td>3.9%</td><td>6.1%</td><td>4.2%</td><td>7.1%</td><td>4.1%</td><td>6.9%</td></tr><tr><td>Other</td><td>6.0%</td><td>11.8%</td><td>6.4%</td><td>10.9%</td><td>6.0%</td><td>12.4%</td></tr><tr><td>Total Employed or Continuing Education</td><td>94.0%</td><td>88.2%</td><td>93.6%</td><td>89.1%</td><td>94.0%</td><td>87.6%</td></tr></table> <p>Note: Percents use the total follow-up reported, not the total number of graduates, as the denominator. * Includes Sheltered Workshops</p> <p>Committee Conclusions:</p> <p>The percentage of all graduates who are employed or continuing education has been about 94 percent for the past three years. The percentage for graduates with disabilities is approximately 6 percent lower. A higher percentage of students with disabilities are employed whereas a larger percentage of all students are continuing their education. A concern with this data is that follow-up information is not being reported for all graduates with disabilities, however reporting has been increasing. Future follow-up data collections will include a category titled “Unable to Locate” which will enable school districts to account for all of their graduates.</p>		1999 Graduates		2000 Graduates		2001 Graduates			All	Disabled	All	Disabled	All	Disabled	2-Year College	22.7%	18.2%	23.1%	20.6%	24.7%	23.6%	4-Year College	39.6%	8.5%	40.0%	12.0%	40.0%	12.6%	Employed *	24.4%	51.7%	22.7%	46.2%	21.5%	41.7%	Military	3.3%	3.7%	3.7%	3.2%	3.7%	2.9%	Non-college	3.9%	6.1%	4.2%	7.1%	4.1%	6.9%	Other	6.0%	11.8%	6.4%	10.9%	6.0%	12.4%	Total Employed or Continuing Education	94.0%	88.2%	93.6%	89.1%	94.0%	87.6%
	1999 Graduates		2000 Graduates		2001 Graduates																																																											
	All	Disabled	All	Disabled	All	Disabled																																																										
2-Year College	22.7%	18.2%	23.1%	20.6%	24.7%	23.6%																																																										
4-Year College	39.6%	8.5%	40.0%	12.0%	40.0%	12.6%																																																										
Employed *	24.4%	51.7%	22.7%	46.2%	21.5%	41.7%																																																										
Military	3.3%	3.7%	3.7%	3.2%	3.7%	2.9%																																																										
Non-college	3.9%	6.1%	4.2%	7.1%	4.1%	6.9%																																																										
Other	6.0%	11.8%	6.4%	10.9%	6.0%	12.4%																																																										
Total Employed or Continuing Education	94.0%	88.2%	93.6%	89.1%	94.0%	87.6%																																																										

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION																																																																											
<p>BT.1.6: Does the percentage of youth with disabilities participating in post-school activities (e.g., employment, education, etc.) increase annually?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Graduate follow-up dataPost-vocational training follow-up dataMonitoring data <p>Related CSPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Access to the General Education CurriculumMissouri Transition Alliance Project (MOTAP)Secondary Transition	<p>Data Summary: Graduate follow-up data – see BT.1.5</p> <table><tr><th colspan="5">Post-Vocational Training Follow-up for Students with Disabilities</th></tr><tr><th></th><th colspan="2">1999 Graduates Follow-Up</th><th colspan="2">2000 Graduates Follow-Up</th></tr><tr><th></th><th>#</th><th>%</th><th>#</th><th>%</th></tr><tr><td>Employed Related to Vocational Training</td><td>657</td><td>38.7%</td><td>716</td><td>36.6%</td></tr><tr><td>Employed Not Related to Vocational Training</td><td>415</td><td>24.4%</td><td>443</td><td>22.7%</td></tr><tr><td>Continuing Education Related to Vocational Training</td><td>294</td><td>17.3%</td><td>415</td><td>21.2%</td></tr><tr><td>Continuing Education Not Related to Vocational Training</td><td>135</td><td>7.9%</td><td>139</td><td>7.1%</td></tr><tr><td>Military Related to Vocational Training</td><td>30</td><td>1.8%</td><td>26</td><td>1.3%</td></tr><tr><td>Military Not Related to Vocational Training</td><td>17</td><td>1.0%</td><td>22</td><td>1.1%</td></tr><tr><td>Not Employed to Vocational Training</td><td>84</td><td>4.9%</td><td>101</td><td>5.2%</td></tr><tr><td>Not Available for Placement</td><td>31</td><td>1.8%</td><td>48</td><td>2.5%</td></tr><tr><td>Status Unknown</td><td>36</td><td>2.1%</td><td>45</td><td>2.3%</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>1,699</td><td>100.0%</td><td>1,955</td><td>100.0%</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>Percent Employed or Continuing Education</td><td></td><td>91.1%</td><td></td><td>90.1%</td></tr></table> <p>Monitoring Data</p> <p>FY2002 Monitoring Standard Secondary Transition-1 – The district identifies and makes available a variety of appropriate community work opportunities for children with disabilities: 1 of 88, 1.14 percent of agencies noncompliant</p> <p>FY2002 Monitoring Standard Secondary Transition-2 – The percentage of students with disabilities employed or enrolled in continuing education six months post graduation will increase or be maintained at a high level: 20 of 69, 28.99 percent of agencies noncompliant</p> <p>FY2002 Monitoring Standard Secondary Transition-12 – The percentage of students with disabilities employed or enrolled in continuing educations six months post vocational training will increase or be maintained at a high level: not monitored in FY02</p>	Post-Vocational Training Follow-up for Students with Disabilities						1999 Graduates Follow-Up		2000 Graduates Follow-Up			#	%	#	%	Employed Related to Vocational Training	657	38.7%	716	36.6%	Employed Not Related to Vocational Training	415	24.4%	443	22.7%	Continuing Education Related to Vocational Training	294	17.3%	415	21.2%	Continuing Education Not Related to Vocational Training	135	7.9%	139	7.1%	Military Related to Vocational Training	30	1.8%	26	1.3%	Military Not Related to Vocational Training	17	1.0%	22	1.1%	Not Employed to Vocational Training	84	4.9%	101	5.2%	Not Available for Placement	31	1.8%	48	2.5%	Status Unknown	36	2.1%	45	2.3%	Total	1,699	100.0%	1,955	100.0%						Percent Employed or Continuing Education		91.1%		90.1%
Post-Vocational Training Follow-up for Students with Disabilities																																																																												
	1999 Graduates Follow-Up		2000 Graduates Follow-Up																																																																									
	#	%	#	%																																																																								
Employed Related to Vocational Training	657	38.7%	716	36.6%																																																																								
Employed Not Related to Vocational Training	415	24.4%	443	22.7%																																																																								
Continuing Education Related to Vocational Training	294	17.3%	415	21.2%																																																																								
Continuing Education Not Related to Vocational Training	135	7.9%	139	7.1%																																																																								
Military Related to Vocational Training	30	1.8%	26	1.3%																																																																								
Military Not Related to Vocational Training	17	1.0%	22	1.1%																																																																								
Not Employed to Vocational Training	84	4.9%	101	5.2%																																																																								
Not Available for Placement	31	1.8%	48	2.5%																																																																								
Status Unknown	36	2.1%	45	2.3%																																																																								
Total	1,699	100.0%	1,955	100.0%																																																																								
Percent Employed or Continuing Education		91.1%		90.1%																																																																								

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION																				
BT.1.6: Concluded	Committee Conclusions: In the three years for which data is available the percentage of all graduates with disabilities who are employed or are continuing education has remained constant at about 88 percent. Likewise, about 90 percent of graduates who participated in vocational programs are employed or are continuing education. While the percentages are not generally increasing, they are being maintained close to 90 percent. Monitoring data indicates that districts are making community work opportunities available for youth with disabilities.																				
BT.1.7: Do available linkages to transition service providers outside the SEA increase for youth with disabilities? Data Sources: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Monitoring data Related CSPD: <ul style="list-style-type: none">Missouri Transition Alliance Project (MOTAP)Secondary Transition	Data Summary: <div>Monitoring Data Monitoring Indicator 101860 - Individuals from outside agencies, if appropriate, attended IEP meeting</div> <table><tr><th></th><th># Districts monitored on this standard</th><th># Districts out of compliance (Initial)</th><th># Districts out of compliance Follow-up1</th><th># Districts out of compliance Follow-up2</th></tr><tr><td>FY1999</td><td>81</td><td>12</td><td>1</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>FY2000</td><td>94</td><td>10</td><td>0</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>FY2001</td><td>96</td><td>12</td><td>Incomplete</td><td></td></tr></table> FY2002 Monitoring Standard Secondary Transition-9 – The district involves other agencies in transition planning, when appropriate: not monitored in FY02 The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) reviews the individualized education program (IEP) to determine if an agency has been identified as an agency that may provide or pay for particular services. If an agency has been identified, DESE reviews documentation that the agency was invited to the IEP meeting. If the agency did not attend the meeting, DESE reviews to determine how the district obtained the agency’s input. Committee Conclusions: Monitoring data indicates that 10 to 15 percent of districts were initially out of compliance on appropriate attendance at the IEP meeting by individuals from outside agencies. Virtually all noncompliant districts were in compliance at their first follow-up. No other data is available on linkages outside the local educational agency (LEA).		# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2	FY1999	81	12	1	0	FY2000	94	10	0		FY2001	96	12	Incomplete	
	# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2																	
FY1999	81	12	1	0																	
FY2000	94	10	0																		
FY2001	96	12	Incomplete																		

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION															
<p>BT.1.8*: Do children with disabilities, beginning at age fourteen or younger, if appropriate, have individualized education programs (IEPs) that include a statement of transition service needs that focuses on the student’s course of study?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Monitoring data• Focus group data <p>Related CSPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Leadership Series – Compliance• Missouri Transition Alliance Project (MOTAP)• Network for High Schools with Results• Secondary Transition	<p>Data Summary:</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Monitoring Data</p> <p>FY2002 Monitoring Standard Secondary Transition-5 – Children with disabilities, beginning at age fourteen, have IEPs that focus on a course of study related to transition objectives: 21 of 92, 22.83 percent of agencies noncompliant</p> <p>Monitoring Indicator 101835 – A statement of needed transition services on IEP beginning at age fourteen.</p> <table><tr><td></td><td># Districts monitored on this standard</td><td># Districts out of compliance (Initial)</td><td># Districts out of compliance Follow-up1</td><td># Districts out of compliance Follow-up2</td></tr><tr><td>FY2000</td><td>94</td><td>28</td><td>2</td><td>Incomplete</td></tr><tr><td>FY2001</td><td>96</td><td>33</td><td>Incomplete</td><td></td></tr></table> <p style="text-align: right;">Focus Group Summary</p> <p>The students who participated in the focus groups reported that transition service needs had been included in their IEP discussions beginning at age fourteen. The students reported that the options available to them and the requirements for each of the options had been discussed with them. The juniors and seniors felt they were well prepared for their post secondary choices and they credited their resource teachers with the preparation.</p> <p>Committee Conclusions:</p> <p>DESE did not monitor on this standard during FY99 because school districts were required to incorporate the new regulations under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) Reauthorization of 1997 beginning in July 1998. Any IEPs reviewed during FY 99 would have been for IEPs developed the previous year before the new regulation took effect. The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) determined that they would give school districts an additional year to apply the new regulations to any IEPs developed. Monitoring in FY00 and FY01 found 30 to 35 percent of districts out of compliance. Although there were a significant number of districts found to not be in compliance during the initial review, that number dropped considerably during follow-up review. This indicates that districts took the necessary corrective actions to become in compliance as it pertains to this standard.</p>		# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2	FY2000	94	28	2	Incomplete	FY2001	96	33	Incomplete	
	# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2												
FY2000	94	28	2	Incomplete												
FY2001	96	33	Incomplete													

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION																				
<p>BT.1.9: Do available linkages to independent living providers outside the State Education Agency (SEA) increase for youth with disabilities?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Independent Living Services student count obtained from the State Independent Living Centers (SILC)Monitoring data <p>Related CSPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Missouri Transition Alliance Project (MOTAP)	<p>Data Summary:</p> <p>Number of Students Served by Independent Living Centers</p> <table><tr><th>Age Group</th><th>FY 00</th><th>FY01</th><th>% Change</th></tr><tr><td>0 to 6</td><td>48</td><td>132</td><td>175.0%</td></tr><tr><td>6 to 17</td><td>240</td><td>291</td><td>21.3%</td></tr><tr><td>18 to 22</td><td>274</td><td>401</td><td>46.4%</td></tr><tr><td>Total</td><td>562</td><td>824</td><td>46.6%</td></tr></table> <p>Monitoring Data</p> <p>FY 2002 Monitoring Indicator B 106900 – IEP includes a statement of the interagency responsibilities or needed linkages related to transition services (age sixteen+): 5 of 77, 6.49 percent of agencies noncompliant</p> <p>FY 2002 Monitoring Standard Secondary Transition-7 – Children with disabilities, beginning at age sixteen, have individualized education programs (IEPs) that coordinate instruction (including related services), community and employment experiences, adult living objectives, and linkages with other service providers or agencies as determined appropriate to meet the post secondary goals of the student: 15 of 88, 17.05 percent of agencies noncompliant</p> <p>Committee Conclusions:</p> <p>Data indicate that linkages do exist and that the number of students served by Centers for Independent Living is increasing. Additional analysis of the FY02 monitoring standard is needed to determine the reasons for the noncompliance. More data is needed to better address this indicator.</p>	Age Group	FY 00	FY01	% Change	0 to 6	48	132	175.0%	6 to 17	240	291	21.3%	18 to 22	274	401	46.4%	Total	562	824	46.6%
Age Group	FY 00	FY01	% Change																		
0 to 6	48	132	175.0%																		
6 to 17	240	291	21.3%																		
18 to 22	274	401	46.4%																		
Total	562	824	46.6%																		

COMPONENT BT.2*: Are youth with disabilities involved in appropriate transition planning?

Overview Answer: Students are involved in transition planning through the individualized education program (IEP) process. At all of the focus group locations, both the students and the parents of students fourteen or older reported that the students and the parents were involved in transition planning. None of the students or parents in the focus groups had any complaints about transition planning.

Strengths: There is a focus on self-advocacy and self-determination for students with disabilities and increased training in the area of transition for systemic change. Missouri provides training to teachers and other providers regarding self-advocacy. The support of the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) developed IEP model helps school districts show the transition services they are providing and there is increased documentation of transition services. Expanding the methods of delivery for trainings has allowed the State Education Agency (SEA) to reach more individuals. Efforts through the Missouri Transition Alliance Partnership (MOTAP) grant include the development of curricula designed to meet the needs of youth with disabilities as they transition from secondary to post-secondary outcomes. Focus group data show that students and parents are involved in the transition experience.

Areas of Concern: Even though information is provided in all areas of the state, school districts in rural areas do not always have the resources or a system in place for them to implement the services they would like to provide.

Other Comments: The committee recommends that the Division emphasize the importance of effective transition planning regardless of district size and/or location as well as consistency in the way that transition planning is carried out in all districts. Focusing on professional development regarding differentiating instruction for classroom teachers will provide students with additional resources for determining post-secondary options.

A Transition Symposium will be held October 23-25th of 2002 and will focus on providing opportunities to build local partnerships within each region of the state to further improve transition planning and to increase the post-school outcomes for youth with disabilities. Participants will also receive best strategies and information to assist them in their responsibility to provide effective transition services/planning for youth with disabilities. Participants will include Special Education personnel, Work Experience Coordinators, Vocational Rehabilitation District Supervisors and Counselors, Vocational Resource Educators, Centers for Independent Living staff and Community Vocational Rehabilitation/Supported Employment providers. It is estimated that three hundred participants will attend.

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION																				
<p>BT.2.1: Do youth with disabilities, beginning at age fourteen or younger, if appropriate, participate in transition planning?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Monitoring dataFocus group data <p>Related CSPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Leadership Series – ComplianceSecondary Transition	<p>Data summary:</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Monitoring Data</p> <p>Monitoring Indicator 101850 - Student attended Individualized Education Program (IEP) meeting or documentation of how team obtained student's input</p> <table><tr><th></th><th># Districts monitored on this standard</th><th># Districts out of compliance (Initial)</th><th># Districts out of compliance Follow-up1</th><th># Districts out of compliance Follow-up2</th></tr><tr><td>FY1999</td><td>81</td><td>5</td><td>1</td><td>0</td></tr><tr><td>FY2000</td><td>94</td><td>14</td><td>0</td><td></td></tr><tr><td>FY2001</td><td>96</td><td>21</td><td>Incomplete</td><td></td></tr></table> <p>FY2002 Monitoring Standard Secondary Transition-5 – Children with disabilities, beginning at age fourteen, have IEPs that focus on a course of study related to transition objectives: 21 of 92, 22.83 percent of agencies noncompliant</p> <p>FY2002 Monitoring Standard Secondary Transition-6 – Children age fourteen+ participate in meetings related to transition planning or activities: 15 of 89, 16.85 percent of agencies noncompliant</p> <p>FY2002 Monitoring Standard Secondary Transition-8 – The child's interests and preferences are identified and considered when addressing transition activities: 15 of 89, 16.85 percent of agencies noncompliant</p> <p>FY2002 Monitoring Indicator B 104520 – If purpose includes transition, students 14 years and up are invited: 13 of 89, 14.61 percent noncompliant</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Focus Group Summary</p> <p>The juniors and seniors in the focus groups reported that they had participated in transition planning in their IEP meetings. The students were very aware of all the aspects of services related to transition.</p> <p>Committee Conclusions:</p> <p>Monitoring data suggests that most districts are in compliance with participation in transition planning, if not at the initial review, then by the first follow-up. Focus group data suggests that students do participate in transition planning.</p>		# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2	FY1999	81	5	1	0	FY2000	94	14	0		FY2001	96	21	Incomplete	
	# Districts monitored on this standard	# Districts out of compliance (Initial)	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up1	# Districts out of compliance Follow-up2																	
FY1999	81	5	1	0																	
FY2000	94	14	0																		
FY2001	96	21	Incomplete																		

LIST THE QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE STUDIED AND THE DATA SOURCES REVIEWED	SUMMARIZE THE CURRENT STATUS AND CONCLUSIONS FOR THIS QUESTION
<p>BT.2.2: Does the percentage of youth with disabilities exercising their rights and responsibilities, as appropriate, regarding special education at the age of majority increase?</p> <p>Data Sources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitoring data • Focus group data <p>Related CSPD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leadership Series – Compliance • Secondary Transition 	<p>Data Summary:</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Monitoring Data</p> <p>FY2002 Monitoring Indicator B 106600 – Child informed of the transfer of rights by the seventeenth birthday: 13 of 72, 18.06 percent of agencies noncompliant</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Focus Group Summary</p> <p>Students over the age of 18 did indicate that they make their own choices, participate in IEP meetings and sign their own documents.</p> <p>Committee Conclusions:</p> <p>The committee defined "exercising their rights" as it relates to eighteen-year-old youth with disabilities as knowing about the rights that would transfer to them at age eighteen, receiving any training and/or participating in activities related to self-advocacy and/or self-determination and active involvement in IEP planning. Data that could be used to measure this is not available. Available monitoring data suggests that youth are often not informed of the transfer of rights by the seventeenth birthday, although the problem is more likely to be an omission of documentation than true noncompliance.</p>